UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,522	01/02/2004	Beka Solomon	SOLOMON=2B.2	9533

1444 7590 11/13/2008

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
624 NINTH STREET, NW
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303

EXAMINER	
EMCH, GREGORY S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1649	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/13/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/749,522	SOLOMON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gregory S. Emch	1649	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 August 2008 and 12 September 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-11 and 25-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *1-6* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *7-11 and 25-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) *1-11 and 25-34* are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12 September 2007 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

The communications dated 12 September 2007 and 15 October 2007 have been received and entered in full. Claims 1-11 and 25-34 are pending in the instant application.

Claims 1-6 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicants timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 13 June 2006.

Claims 7-11 and 25-34 are under examination in the instant office action.

Withdrawn rejections

Applicants' arguments in the replies filed on 12 September 2007 and 15 October 2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 7-11 and 25-34 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made as set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.,* 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 7-11 and 25-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Solomon et al. (Proc Natl Acad Sci USA, April 1997; 94:4109-4112 as listed on Applicant's IDS) and Hanan & Solomon (Amyloid: Int J Exp Clin Invest, 1996; 3:130-133, listed on IDS), both as evidenced by Frenkel et al. (J Neuroimmunol, August 1998; 88: 85-90, listed on IDS), and both in view of US Patent No. 5,622,699 to Ruoslahti et al., issued 22 April 1997, filed 11 September 1995 and US Patent No. 5,846,533 to Prusiner et al., issued 8 December 1998, filed 13 September 1996 (listed on IDS).

The claims are drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising a filamentous bacteriophage, wherein said filamentous bacteriophage consists of a filamentous bacteriophage that displays an antibody or epitope binding fragment thereof, wherein said antibody and epitope binding fragment thereof bind to an epitope of β-amyloid so as to inhibit aggregation of β-amyloid in a subject and/or to cause disaggregation of a β-amyloid aggregate in a subject, wherein said filamentous bacteriophage displaying said antibody or epitope binding fragment is an active ingredient of the composition and the composition further comprises a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier (claims 7-11). The claims are also directed to a composition comprising said bacteriophage displaying said antibody or epitope binding fragment and a carrier (claims 25-29). The claims are further drawn to a filamentous bacteriophage that displays an antibody or epitope

binding fragment thereof as described above (claims 30-34). Additional claim limitations include: wherein said epitope of β-amyloid comprises SEQ ID NO: 1 (claims 8, 26, and 31), wherein said antibody or binding fragment is displayed on said bacteriophage via coat glycoprotein VIII (claims 9, 27, and 32), wherein said epitope is contained in a peptide selected from the group consisting of SEQ ID NOs: 7, 8, 21 and 22 (claims 10, 28, and 33), and wherein said β-amyloid is selected from the group consisting of A β39, A β40, A β41, Aβ42, and A β43 (claims 11,29, and 34).

The teachings of Solomon et al. and Hanan & Solomon are cumulative. Both references teach the inhibition and disaggregation of β-amyloid peptide by monoclonal antibodies. The monoclonal antibodies found to be significantly effective in interfering with the aggregation of β-amyloid *in vitro* are 6C6 and 10D5, both of which recognize an epitope within Aβ1-16 (see Figure 1 of each reference). Solomon (1997) also demonstrates that the 6C6 mAb (monoclonal antibody) was effective at inhibiting the neurotoxic effects of fibrillar β-amyloid on PC12 cells in culture (see Figure 4, p. 4111). For these experiments, the antibodies were added in a composition comprising phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) (see p. 4110, 1st paragraph), as in the claimed limitation of a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier or simply, a carrier. Although the specific anti-aggregating epitope that these antibodies recognize is not specifically recited by the authors, subsequent work from this group established that the N-terminal EFRH sequence, which is the instantly claimed SEQ ID NO: 1, is residues 3- 6 of β-amyloid and represents the sequential epitope of mAbs 6C6 and 10D5 (see Frenkel et al., 1998), as in claims 8, 26, and 31. The EFRH sequence is also contained within each

of the amino acid sequences of SEQ ID NOs: 7, 8, 21, and 22, as in claims 10, 28, and 33. Solomon et al. (1997) notes that Alzheimer's disease-associated plaques are predominantly comprised of a 40-to 42-mer β-amyloid peptide (see p. 4109, 1st paragraph), as in claims 11, 29, and 34. Solomon et al. thus suggests that high-affinity, site-directed mAbs (or compounds that may mimic their biological activities as genetically engineered small antibodies or peptide mimetics), which trigger reversal of the pathological aggregation of β-amyloid to its nontoxic components, may be used in the development of therapeutic active molecules for the treatment of such diseases as Alzheimer's disease and prion diseases (see p. 4112).

Neither Solomon et al. nor Hanan & Solomon teach compositions comprising filamentous bacteriophage which displays an antibody or epitope binding fragment thereof. However, the Ruoslahti et al. patent teaches an *in vivo* panning method that comprises screening a phage peptide display library in mice and identifying specific peptides that selectively home to brain or to kidney. The patent teaches that phage libraries that display protein receptor molecules, including an antibody or an antigen binding fragment of an antibody such an Fv, Fd or Fab fragment; can be used to practice the invention (col. 4, lines 21-37). Thus, the reference teaches that an antibody or epitope binding fragment thereof can be displayed on a bacteriophage for *in vivo* administration.

None of the above cited references teaches displaying the antibody or epitope binding fragment thereof on the bacteriophage via coat glycoprotein VIII. However, the Prusiner et al. patent teaches methodologies for producing a variety of different prion

protein antibodies for use in neutralization or purification of prion proteins or for *in vivo* use (see column 4, lines 61-67). For this purpose, Prusiner et al. teach genetically engineered phages which express a specific binding protein of an antibody on their surfaces (see column 5, lines 3-5). The desired peptide, such as an antibody or Fab or Fv antibody fragment (see column 23, lines 31-32), displayed on the surface of a filamentous phage (e.g., M13, fl, fd, and equivalent filamentous phages) is anchored via a membrane anchor domain found in the coat proteins encoded by gene III or gene VIII (i.e., cpIII or cpVIII coat proteins) (see column 24, line 38 through column 25, line 4, and column 26, lines 35-41), as in claims 9, 27, and 32.

Upon reading the disclosure of the Solomon et al. reference and the Hanan & Solomon et al. reference, the skilled artisan would have recognized the desirability of developing compositions comprising Aβ anti-aggregating antibodies. Furthermore, the Ruoslahti et al. patent teaches that antibodies or epitope binding fragments thereof can be displayed by a bacteriophage for *in vivo* use. Thus, as evidenced by the prior art, the skilled artisan would have known that developing alternative antibody compositions would be desirable. Furthermore, it would have been reasonable to predict that the anti-aggregating antibodies or epitope binding fragments thereof of the Solomon et al. and the Hanan & Solomon references could be successfully displayed by a bacteriophage via coat glycoprotein VIII as taught by Ruoslahti et al. and Prusiner et al. Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to improve the antibodies or epitope binding fragments as disclosed by Ruoslahti et al. and Prusiner et al. to yield predictable results. This is

because the artisan has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp to obtain predictable results.

In the reply filed on 12 September 2007 regarding the previous rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), Applicants assert that the skilled artisan having common sense at the time of the invention would not have reasonably looked to Prusiner or Pasqualini to solve a problem of antibody delivery to the brain, particularly in view of the fact that neither Prusiner nor Pasqualini are related to antibody delivery, (the Pasqualini reference was cited under the previous rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and is not part of the instant rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)). Applicants assert that Pasqualini does not use filamentous phage as a delivery system and that Pasqualini uses the phage as a means to generate a random peptide library. Applicants assert that there is nothing in Prusiner or Pasqualini that would suggest that displaying the antibody on a phage would provide any better delivery than simply administering the antibody directly. Applicants assert that the skilled artisan, using common sense, would not be motivated to use phage as a delivery vehicle for an antibody because phage is known to be immunogenic and to increase the immunogenicity of any peptide carried thereby and submits the Delmastro et al. reference as evidence in support of this assertion. Applicants assert that the skilled artisan would expect that administration of antibodies displayed by filamentous phage would cause an undesirable immune reaction.

Applicants' arguments have been fully considered and are not found persuasive. The previously cited Pasqualini reference is related to the Ruoslahti et al. patent in that

Pasqualini is an inventor on the patent and the two disclosures share common subject matter. However, one difference between the two disclosures is that the Ruoslahti et al. patent explicitly teaches displaying an antibody on a bacteriophage for *in vivo* use. Thus, Applicants' arguments with respect to the previous Pasqualini reference are largely moot, and it is not necessary that the Prusiner reference teach using filamentous phage as a delivery system for therapeutic use. Also as stated previously, the recitation of "a pharmaceutical composition" in claims 7-11 has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See In re Hirao, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and Kropa v. Robie, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478,481 (CCPA 1951). Moreover, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. Regardless, given that the Ruoslahti et al. patent explicitly teaches an advantage of displaying an antibody or epitope binding fragment thereof on a bacteriophage for *in vivo* use (i.e., diagnostic use), the patent teaches an advantage of displaying an antibody, such as those taught by Solomon et al. and/or Hanan & Solomon, on a bacteriophage. Prusiner et al. provides specific teachings of how such an antibody may be displayed on a filamentous bacteriophage, i.e. via coat

glycoprotein VIII. Additionally, it is noted that a composition taught by the combination of the instant prior art references is not incompatible with a therapeutic intent.

Regarding Applicants' assertions that the skilled artisan would not be motivated to combine based the possible undesirable immune response taught by the Delmastro et al. reference, the fact that the Ruoslahti et al. patent explicitly teaches displaying an antibody on a bacteriophage for *in vivo* diagnostic use in mice is given greater evidentiary weight than said assertions. The instant claims are directed to compositions and are not drawn to methods of passive vaccination. The Ruoslahti et al. patent teaches a composition comprising an antibody or epitope binding fragment displayed on a bacteriophage for diagnostic use to identify molecules that home to the brain. Given that the antibodies of Solomon et al. and/or Hanan & Solomon bind to Aβ, a peptide that is expressed in the brain, it would have been reasonable to predict that a composition comprising such an antibody or epitope binding fragment thereof displayed on a bacteriophage would be useful in Ruoslahti et al.'s diagnostic methods.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Advisory Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory S. Emch whose telephone number is (571) 272-8149. The examiner can normally be reached 9:00 am - 5:30 pm EST (M-F).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey J. Stucker can be reached at (571) 272-0911. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/G.E./

Gregory S. Emch, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1649
07 November 2008

/Elizabeth C. Kemmerer/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1646